



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

#8/14 for
8-22-02
CN

Art Unit: 2123)
Examiner: H. Jones)
Applicant(s): G. Strumolo et al.)
Serial No.: 09/432,485)
Filing Date: November 1, 1999)
For: PAINT SPRAY PARTICLE TRAJECTORY)
ANALYSIS METHOD AND SYSTEM)

RECEIVED

AUG 20 2002

Technology Center 2100

AMENDMENT

COPY OF PAPERS
ORIGINALLY FILED

Assistant Commissioner for Patents
Washington, D.C. 20231

Dear Sir:

This is in response to the Office Action dated May 9, 2002.

REMARKS

Claims 1 through 6 remain in the application.

Claims 1 through 6 were rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 through 4 of U.S. Patent No. 6,263,300. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Although Applicants disagree with the Examiner, to further prosecution and allowance of the application, a Terminal Disclaimer is being separately filed and a copy attached to this Amendment to overcome the rejection. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1 through 6 overcome the rejection under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting.

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING: (37 C.F.R. 1.8) I hereby certify that this paper (along with any paper referred to as being attached or enclosed) is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service with sufficient postage as First Class mail in an envelope addressed to: Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Washington, D.C. 20231 on August 7, 2002, by Daniel H. Bliss